

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Field evaluation for playback surveys: species-specific detection probabilities and distance estimation errors in a nocturnal bird community**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1799837> since 2023-01-27T08:44:14Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1080/00063657.2021.1968790

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



# UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

***This is an author version of the contribution published on:***

*Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:*

*[**Bird Study**, DOI: 10.1080/00063657.2021.1968790]*

***The definitive version is available at:***

*La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:*

*<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00063657.2021.1968790?src=>*

13 **Field evaluation for playback surveys: ~~identification of nocturnal~~ species-specific**  
14 **detection probabilities and distance estimation errors in a nocturnal bird**  
15 **community ~~estimates in an agricultural landscape~~**

16

17 Giuseppe Orlando (giuseppeorlando96@gmail.com), Andrea Varesio (andre.varesio@gmail.com) and Dan  
18 Chamberlain (dan.chamberlain99@googlemail.com)

19

20 Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Turin, Via Accademia Albertina 13, 10123,  
21 Turin, Italy

22

23

24 **Short title:** Playback field evaluation

25 **Keywords:** binomial GLMM, broadcast experiment, call detection, bird monitoring, elusive birds, owls

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83

**Abstract**

**Capsule:** During playback experiments, the distance from the surveyor to the call influences the chances of detection across nocturnal species in farmland and woodland habitats.

**Aim:** To evaluate how distance affects surveyor detection capability, expressed as the probability of hearing broadcast calls and of estimating their distances correctly, in a nocturnal bird community.

**Methods:** We conducted a playback field experiment in farmland and woodland areas within an agricultural landscape in winter and summer 2020. ~~Recorded~~ Vocalisations of five elusive species (Little Owl *Athene noctua*, Tawny Owl *Strix aluco*, Long-eared Owl *Asio otus*, Common Nightingale *Luscinia megarhynchos*, Water Rail *Rallus aquaticus*) were broadcast at various distances to a surveyor, who attempted to detect them and, if successful, to classify them into predefined distance zones. ~~were broadcast to a surveyor who attempted to estimate the distance to each call.~~ Binomial GLMMs were used to estimate detection probability as a function of distance, and the effects of habitat and season on this relationship.

**Results:** The distance of the broadcast call from the surveyor had a significant effect on detection probability in both habitats. In woodland, the probability of hearing calls was significantly higher in winter, while estimating distances correctly was generally higher in summer. An increase in field experience improved our detection capability, mainly in terms of distance estimation, whose errors were mostly overestimations. ~~Long-eared Owl was the only species for which estimates were consistently poor.~~

**Conclusions:** The probability of hearing calls and distance estimation accuracy varied between species. While a 200 m radius around the surveyor fitted better for the Little and Tawny Owl, this was 100 m for the other species. ~~Most Little Owl and Tawny Owl calls were detected within a 200 m radius of the surveyor, while this was 100 m for the other species.~~ For a multi-species community-level study, playback surveys are thus likely to be most representative of a 200 m radius surrounding the surveyor where the probability of detection is highest, while estimates of distance from the observer are likely to be inaccurate in most cases. Field evaluations such as this should be implemented prior to actual playback surveys.

## 84 Introduction

85

86 Playback is commonly used to survey birds as it represents an efficient method to census elusive species ~~thus~~  
87 by improving their detection probability (Hardy & Morrison 2000, Navarro *et al.* 2005, Stermin *et al.* 2017).  
88 This technique consists of broadcasting generally conspecific recorded calls in order to elicit their vocal reply  
89 (Johnson *et al.* 1981, Worthington-Hill & Conway 2017). This is particularly useful for those species that  
90 exhibit territorial behaviour because they will be more inclined to respond in order to defend their territories  
91 (Haug & Didiuk 1993, Pilla *et al.* 2018). Relying only on spontaneous vocalisations can be insufficient, because  
92 they may limit census performance ~~may be insufficient, thus limiting census performance~~ (Crowe &  
93 Longshore 2013). It is known that factors such as habitat, seasonality, time of day and weather can influence  
94 response rates during playback surveys (Hardy & Morrison 2000, Currie *et al.* 2002, Polak 2005, Braga *et al.*  
95 2009, Johnson *et al.* 2009). In addition, more technical parameters such as sound amplitude level and  
96 surveyor detection ability or experience (Crowe & Longshore 2013, Zuberogoitia *et al.* 2020) are also  
97 fundamental as they enable a detectability radius to be defined, which is a threshold distance expressing at  
98 what scale bird distributions can be better estimated, i.e. a distance around playback points within which a  
99 surveyor has higher probabilities to detect birds. Usually, only responses detected at a distance within the  
100 radius are included in the analysis, since it provides some level of security, so that results include most  
101 individuals actually occupying a given area ~~which is the maximum distance around playback points that~~  
102 ~~allows surveyors to hear and detect birds. Responses from an estimated distance greater than the selected~~  
103 ~~radius are not considered reliable and are typically excluded from the analysis~~ (Centili 2001, Johnson *et al.*  
104 2009, Bolboacă *et al.* 2015). Therefore, the detectability radius has a key role in minimizing biases. During  
105 aural surveys, distance estimation is clearly more difficult than for visual detections and making errors in  
106 estimation can consequently bias the results (Marques 2004).

107 Field evaluations prior to actual playback surveys therefore represent a useful step to adjust the method  
108 by setting a fixed distance (and so a radius) calibrated on the surveyor's detection capability in the field  
109 (Esclarski & Cintra 2014), where radial distance is a function of the surveyor's ability to estimate bird-surveyor

110 distance and to hear broadcast calls. Experimental trials of this kind can help researchers to conduct playback  
111 surveys as accurately as possible. From this perspective, we carried out a field experiment aimed to evaluate  
112 the effect of distance on detectability in different habitats within an agricultural landscape, by addressing the  
113 following questions:

114 (i) Does distance influence the surveyor's ability to hear playback calls and to estimate their  
115 distances correctly in farmland and woodland?

116  
117 (ii) Does the effect of distance in woodland have the same effect on detection probability in summer  
118 and winter?

119

120 In this way, we aimed to understand at what scale nocturnal species detection and distribution can be  
121 estimated in this landscape. As target species, we used territorial playback songs/calls of Common  
122 Nightingale *Luscinia megarhynchos*, Little Owl *Athene noctua*, Tawny Owl *Strix aluco*, Long-eared Owl *Asio*  
123 *otus* and Water Rail *Rallus aquaticus*. Within our study region, these species form a common bird community  
124 with similar elusive habits. These birds are territorial, hard to see, and more active at night. For these reasons,  
125 they are frequently censused through playback, especially from dusk and at night (Zuberogoitia & Campos  
126 1998, Schmidt *et al.* 2006, Brambilla & Jenkins 2009, Seoane & Galván 2010, Stermin *et al.* 2017). Through  
127 our experiment, we attempted to provide a valid insight into the playback method in surveying our target  
128 species effectively.

129

130

## 131 **Methods**

### 132 **Study area**

133 The study was carried out in the Piedmont Region, northern Italy. We conducted playback surveys in an  
134 agricultural landscape dominated by arable crops and interspersed with small woods, within the Natural Park

135 'Parco del Po Vercellese-Alessandrino', in the southern part of Vercelli Province. The first site consisted of a  
136 typical intensive agricultural landscape close to a wetland area (named 'Riserva Naturale Speciale e Zona di  
137 Salvaguardia della Palude di San Genuario', 8°10'54"E, 45°13'7"N) dominated by rice fields, the most  
138 important cultivation of the area. The second site was an oak-hornbeam (*Quercus* and ~~*Populus*~~ *Carpinus*  
139 species) woodland area (named 'Parco Naturale del Bosco delle Sorti della Partecipanza', 8°16'1"E,  
140 45°13'50"N). Both sites are SCIs (Sites of Community Importance) and ZSPs (Zones of Special Protection under  
141 the Birds Directive).

142

#### 143 **Field survey protocol**

144

145 We designed the playback field experiment as follows: in each habitat we established one transect with ten  
146 points, spaced 200 m apart, and each point was visited eight times (i.e. eight repetitions). At each repetition,  
147 one researcher (the 'broadcaster') moved ~~in~~ to a random location around one single surveyor (the 'observer')  
148 and broadcastthe whole call sequence (noting the time of broadcast) of all five species. The surveyor stayed  
149 fixed at each point and (i) noted the time and species when a call was detected and (ii) estimated playback  
150 distances (assigning calls to distance classes of between 0-100 m, 100-200 m, 200-300 m, 300-400 m, 400-  
151 500 m and >500 m). At each repetition, the surveyor did not know the location of the broadcaster. We used  
152 a handheld GPS (Garmin eTrex 10) to identify survey points and to note the location of each playback made  
153 by the broadcaster. We conducted one survey in farmland and one in woodland in winter (between the end  
154 of February and the beginning of March 2020); then we repeated a third survey only in woodland in summer  
155 (mid-July 2020) to test for a seasonal effect in this habitat. We performed all surveys in good weather  
156 conditions (i.e. not on rainy or windy days). Although the target species were nocturnal (Long-eared Owl,  
157 Tawny Owl), crepuscular, or more vocally active at night (Water Rail, Little Owl, Nightingale), we carried out  
158 the surveys in daylight, partly due to access restrictions, but also to minimise the potential confounding  
159 effects of real (rather than ~~recorded~~ broadcast) vocalizations.

160 We delivered playback using a handheld Bluetooth wireless speaker (Tronsmart Element, T6 Mini)  
161 positioned at chest height (Pilla *et al.* 2018), c. 1.6 m above the ground. The device was designed to spread  
162 sound at 360° to ensure that vocalisations were broadcast in all directions. The call sequence consisted of  
163 territorial vocalisations of the five species, downloaded from the Xeno-canto website ([www.xeno-canto.org](http://www.xeno-canto.org)),  
164 which were then uploaded to a smartphone and broadcast with the speaker via Bluetooth. We always  
165 maintained the following order for the sequence: Common Nightingale > Water Rail > Little Owl > Long-eared  
166 Owl > Tawny Owl. For each species, broadcast calls lasted 30 seconds, without intervals between them. After  
167 the whole sequence had been completed, the broadcaster moved to another random location unknown to  
168 the surveyor and repeated it. This procedure was carried out eight times for each point (i.e. eight repetitions  
169 made in eight random locations for each of the ten points). The start and end of each repetition was notified  
170 to the surveyor by text message. Once all the repetitions for a point were completed, the surveyor moved to  
171 the next point along the transect.

172 We adjusted a fixed volume for all broadcasts at a level equivalent to the sound pressure level of natural  
173 vocalizations. We used a sound level meter (SLM Meterk MK 09) to set the volume in order to match natural  
174 levels:  $81 \pm 1$  dB for Common Nightingale (Kiefer *et al.* 2011);  $82 \pm 1$  dB for Little Owl (Jacobsen *et al.* 2013,  
175 Clewley *et al.* 2016); and,  $83 \pm 1$  dB for Tawny Owl (Vrezec & Bertoneclj 2018). We were unable to find  
176 information on Water Rail and Long-eared Owl vocalizations, so we respectively set  $80 \pm 1$  dB and  $73 \pm 1$  dB,  
177 i.e. relatively low values matching our personal observations of these species relative to the others listed  
178 above. We obtained all dB values by positioning the SLM at a distance of 1 m.

179

## 180 **Data analysis**

181

182 We used Garmin BaseCamp software to download location data from the GPS and to calculate real distances  
183 between the surveyor and broadcaster. To evaluate the effect of distance on detection probability, we used  
184 a mixed modelling approach, fitting binomial generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) to explain the  
185 probability ~~to~~ of hearing playback calls (binomial response: 1 = calls heard; 0 = calls not heard) and the



186 probability of estimating distances of those calls that were detected correctly (binomial response: 1 = calls  
187 estimated in the correct distance class; 0 = calls not estimated in the correct distance class). Survey point  
188 identity was specified as a random effect in order to account for repeated observations from the same point,  
189 and real distances, habitat and species were specified as fixed effects. To test for a seasonal effect in  
190 woodland, we used the same approach and included season (winter or summer) and the interaction term  
191 between Real distance and season. Before modelling, the 'Real distance' variable was scaled. Models were  
192 validated using the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit test (Hosmer & Lemeshow 2000), where a significant  
193 test result (as measured by the chi-squared statistic) indicates poor model fit. When this occurred, we used  
194 Cook's distance (Cook 1979) to identify and remove potential outliers.

195 Since we always maintained the same order of species to broadcast calls, there was potential temporal  
196 autocorrelation in the probability of detecting a call between species, for both distance estimation and the  
197 resulting classification into distance classes, since the observer would have known that the whole broadcast  
198 came from the same location (i.e. at the same distance). In other words, after hearing the first call, the  
199 surveyor could have been more likely to detect subsequent calls in the sequence, as they would have known  
200 what came next. For this reason, GLMMs fitted to the ability to hear playback calls could potentially be  
201 affected by non-independence. Therefore, to verify their consistency, we also ran models based on generalized  
202 estimating equations (GEEs) that accounted for the potential non-independence by fitting broadcast call  
203 order as a temporal correlation structure and defining each broadcast of the five species within a playback  
204 repetition as a group that combined point identity and repetition number.

205 Statistical analyses were carried out using R software (v. 3.6.3; R Core Team 2020). GLMMs were fitted in  
206 the lme4 package (Bates *et al.* 2015) and their results visualised with ggplot2 (Wickham 2016). GEE models  
207 were fitted in the geepack package (Halekoh *et al.* 2006).

208

209

## 210 **Results**

211 We carried out 1200 broadcasts in total: 400 in farmland (first survey) and 400 in woodland (second survey)  
212 in winter, and 400 in woodland in summer (third survey). Real distances ranged between 34.6 and 365.5 m  
213 and the number of broadcast calls, correct distance estimates and calls detected varied among distance  
214 classes. Estimating playback distances correctly (c. 28 % of broadcasts were estimated in the correct distance  
215 band) was more difficult than being able to hear broadcast calls (c. 78 % of calls were detected; **Table 1**).

216

217

218

219

#### 220 **Effect of distance on detectability in both habitats in winter**

221

222 The ability to hear playback calls across all species declined significantly with distance (slope =  $-1.64 \pm 0.17$ ,  $z$   
223 =  $-9.69$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; **Table S1a**, Appendix). Predicted probabilities of hearing calls were often high at 200 m,  
224 especially in woodland, and the easiest species to hear was Little Owl (estimated probability = 0.97), followed  
225 by Tawny Owl (0.96), Common Nightingale (0.82), Water Rail (0.81) and Long-eared Owl (0.67; **Figure 1**). At  
226 a distance of 300 m, probabilities dropped, particularly for Long-eared Owl, Water Rail and Common  
227 Nightingale (respectively 0.14, 0.26 and 0.28 in woodland). Detection probabilities were always significantly  
228 higher in woodland than farmland ( $p < 0.001$ ). The Hosmer-Lemeshow test showed a good model fit ( $\chi^2 =$   
229  $8.09$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). The GEE model supported the GLMM in that hearing playback calls declined with  
230 distance very similarly (slope =  $-1.61 \pm 0.15$ ,  $w = 110.96$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; **Table S1b**, Appendix). The lack of any  
231 qualitative difference between the GLMM and GEE results thus suggests that potential temporal  
232 autocorrelation between the calls in a given sequence did not affect the conclusions regarding the estimates  
233 of probability of hearing calls in relation to distance.

234 The ability to estimate playback distances correctly for calls that were detected declined significantly with  
235 distance ~~at greater distances to the broadcaster~~ (slope =  $-1.39 \pm 0.16$ ,  $z = -8.56$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; **Table S1c**,  
236 Appendix). Predicted probabilities of assigning distances to the correct distance band were low: all  $< 18\%$  at

237 200 m and <3% at 300 m (**Figure 2**). In woodland at 200 m, the best estimates were associated with Common  
238 Nightingale (0.17) and the lowest with Long-eared Owl (0.04). Probabilities were significantly higher in  
239 woodland than farmland ( $p < 0.01$ ). The Hosmer-Lemeshow test showed a good model fit ( $\chi^2 = 9.40$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p$   
240  $> 0.05$ ).

241 For detected calls, in the first and second survey, distances estimated wrongly were all overestimation  
242 errors, i.e. the surveyor always placed estimates in a distance class further than the correct one. In total, 248  
243 overestimations were made in the first survey and 215 in the second (**Table S2**, Appendix). ~~Errors decreased~~  
244 ~~between the first to the second survey for each species~~ The number of misclassifications declined in  
245 consecutive surveys for each species except for the Long-eared Owl (**Table S3**, Appendix).

246

247

#### 248 **Seasonal variation in woodland**

249

250 The effect of distance on the ability to hear playback calls was significant (slope =  $-1.42 \pm 0.19$ ,  $z = -7.67$ ,  $p <$   
251  $0.001$ ; **Table S1d**, Appendix), but did not change between the second and third survey, i.e. there was no  
252 difference in slope between winter and summer (parameter estimate =  $-0.16 \pm 0.32$ ,  $z = -0.5$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).  
253 However, season was significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) and predicted probabilities were higher in winter (**Figure 3**). Little  
254 Owl and Tawny Owl were the easiest species to detect, and Long-eared Owl the hardest (respectively 0.97,  
255 0.97 and 0.74 at 200 m in winter). At 200 m, probabilities were generally high, but at 300 m they were always  
256 less than 52 % in summer and 72% in winter. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test did not show a good model fit ( $\chi^2$   
257 = 26.0,  $df = 8$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). We investigated this poor model fit by looking for possible outliers ~~i.e. the~~  
258 ~~observations that mostly negatively influenced the model~~ ~~We used Cook's distance approach (Cook 1979)~~  
259 and we dropped the observations ( $n = 6$ ) which revealed the highest Cook's distance values. This was the  
260 minimum number of observations that enabled an improvement in model fit ( $\chi^2 = 11.0$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). No  
261 qualitative differences were found in the model results (**Table S1e**, Appendix).

262 Again, the GEE model did not show differences compared to the GLMM, neither in terms of the distance  
263 effect on the ability to hear calls (slope =  $-1.04 \pm 0.24$ ,  $w = 19.19$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; **Table S1f**, Appendix) nor in terms  
264 of difference in slope between seasons (parameter estimate =  $-0.45 \pm 0.30$ ,  $w = 2.20$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ).

265 Overall, playback distances were estimated increasingly erroneously in more distant zones (slope =  $-0.76$   
266  $\pm 0.12$ ,  $z = -6.14$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; **Table S1g**, Appendix) and there was a significant seasonal variation (parameter  
267 estimate =  $-0.58 \pm 0.23$ ,  $z = -2.56$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Predicted probabilities were generally higher in summer than in  
268 winter (**Figure 4**) and higher at 200 m than 300 m for all species. ~~Probabilities were quite high at 200 m for~~  
269 ~~all species, but they dropped at 300 m.~~ Higher probabilities were associated with Little Owl and Common  
270 Nightingale (both 0.32 at 200 m and 0.14 at 300 m in summer), while the Long-eared Owl remained the most  
271 difficult species to estimate (0.20 at 200 m and 0.08 at 300 m in summer). The Hosmer-Lemeshow test did  
272 not show a good model fit ( $\chi^2 = 29.0$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). So, as before, we dropped the minimum number of  
273 observations ( $n = 20$ ) with the highest Cook's distance values which enabled to improve the model fit ( $\chi^2 =$   
274  $14.0$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). No qualitative differences were found in the model results, except for an increase in  
275 the significance of seasonal variation (parameter estimate =  $-0.89 \pm 0.28$ ,  $z = -3.16$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ; **Table S1h**,  
276 Appendix).

277 In the third survey, overestimations decreased (from 100 % in both the first and second survey to 64 % in  
278 the third), but there were also some underestimations (36 %) which occurred between 0-100 m and 100-200  
279 m. However, the surveyor made in total fewer wrong estimates ( $n = 139$ ). In fact, no erroneous estimates  
280 were made in the two furthestmost classes (**Table S2**, Appendix). In relation to species, errors decreased  
281 overall (**Table S3**, Appendix).

282

283

## 284 Discussion

285 Through this field evaluation, we investigated the effect of distance on surveyor detection capability,  
286 expressed in terms of being able to hear playback calls and estimating distances to the calls correctly and

287 ~~estimating their distances in the correct distance class.~~ Other studies have attempted to evaluate the  
288 response distance of elusive birds and the distance from the surveyor (Proudfoot *et al.* 2002, Flesch & Steidl  
289 2007, Bartolommei *et al.* 2012), because its measurement helps to improve detection and determine bird  
290 densities. Monitoring nocturnal birds, Puglisi & Bartolommei (2012) estimated the distance of detected birds  
291 from the surveyor, selecting four distance classes (<50, 50–100, 100–300 and >300 m). They always detected  
292 Long-eared Owl at distances less than 100 m, whereas Little Owl and Tawny Owl were detected across all  
293 classes. Such classes were considered by Bartolommei *et al.* (2012), who adopted a 300 m radius in their  
294 methods to investigate the presence and distribution of Little Owl and Tawny Owl according to land-use  
295 categories in an agricultural landscape of Central Italy. ~~These estimates reflect our own investigation into~~  
296 ~~surveyor's estimation ability~~ Instead, unlike Bartolommei *et al.* (2012), but in our experiment we specifically  
297 fitted models to evaluate separately the probability to detect calls and to estimate distances correctly in  
298 relation to distance, testing also a seasonal effect.

299 Some playback field experiments have already been conducted in forested habitats to evaluate distance  
300 estimates and their error structure for various songbirds, using known distances. Alldredge *et al.* (2007) used  
301 playback songs of several birds (Acadian Flycatcher *Empidonax virescens*, Black-and-white Warbler *Mniotilta*  
302 *varia*, Black-throated green Warbler *Dendroica virens*, Red-breasted Nuthatch *Sitta canadensis*, and Wood  
303 Thrush *Hylocichla mustelina*) and found that surveyors had difficulties to identify what was the distance to  
304 the bird song at distances beyond 65 m. ~~and found that surveyors could not discriminate between songs at~~  
305 ~~different distances beyond 65 m.~~ They also pointed out that, after training, surveyors reduced distance  
306 estimation errors. In our approach, we instead used unknown distances, chosen randomly by the  
307 broadcaster, and the surveyor was unaware of their location. This had the objective of simulating real  
308 situations in the field, when surveyors have to census species that can be anywhere. Moreover, in our study,  
309 we considered detection both in terms of the ability to estimate distances and the ability to hear broadcast  
310 calls.

311

312 **The effect of distance on surveyor detection capability**

313

314 Our results showed that detectability varied due to both species and distance. ~~Our results showed marked~~  
315 ~~variation in detectability as a function of distance between species.~~ The decrease in detectability was  
316 especially marked in those species whose calls are low in acoustic intensity. In particular, this was the case  
317 for the Long-eared Owl, the hardest species to hear and to estimate distance. This was consistent with our  
318 expectations as its territorial call is not very loud. On the contrary, Little Owl and Tawny Owl were the easiest  
319 species to detect, thanks to their shrill and more acute vocalisations. Water Rail and Common Nightingale  
320 were challenging to detect, but not as difficult as Long-eared Owl, although during the summer survey,  
321 Common Nightingale showed estimates as high as those for Little Owl, and Water Rail as high as those for  
322 Tawny Owl. Detecting playback calls was less difficult than estimating their distances correctly, but we noted  
323 an improvement in both (respectively a c. 20 % and 28 % increase) between the first and the second survey.  
324 In woodland, detectability was higher overall. This is a surprising result as we did not expect such a striking  
325 difference compared to farmland. Nevertheless, the latter habitat, being an open environment, could have  
326 been more influenced by potential background noise (e.g. from roads nearby), which may explain this  
327 divergence. Though, we suggest caution in interpreting this difference and more field trials would be useful  
328 to better assess this aspect.

329 The ability to hear playback calls in woodland did not improve during the third survey in summer. The  
330 probability of hearing broadcast calls was significantly ~~inferior~~ lower in summer than winter ( $p < 0.001$ ). This  
331 can be explained by the likely blocking effect of the dense vegetative structure characterizing woodland in  
332 this season. Moreover, in summer this habitat is more disturbed in terms of background sounds: Throughout  
333 the summer survey, there was a continuous noise, represented especially by the singing of grasshoppers and  
334 Common Blackbirds *Turdus merula*. Together with the thick foliage, sound diffusion was hampered.  
335 Therefore, in summer woodland can act as a natural “acoustic barrier”, limiting the surveyor’s ability to hear  
336 bird calls (**Figure 5**). Conversely, in winter, there was less acoustic disturbance.

337 Despite the dense vegetation and background noise, the effect of distance on the ability to estimate  
338 playback distances improved significantly in summer, during the last survey. ~~improved in the last survey and~~

339 ~~varied significantly with season.~~ This fact is likely due to an increase in our field experience. After the first  
340 survey, we were able to better calibrate estimates and reduce errors, in particular in terms of overestimated  
341 distances. For detected calls, distance estimate errors decreased by 8.3 % between the first and second  
342 survey and by 19 % between the second and the third. Surveyor experience has already been demonstrated  
343 to be a relevant factor affecting bird detection probabilities (Booms *et al.* 2010, Jiguet & Williamson 2010,  
344 Johnston *et al.* 2018), including nocturnal species (Zuberogitia *et al.* 2020). A radial distance of about 200  
345 m, at which playback could be heard, has previously been adopted to census Tawny Owls (Appleby *et al.*  
346 1999). In another case, a distance of 300 m was used for Tawny Owl and Little Owl (Bartolommei *et al.* 2012)  
347 as it proved to be the best estimated distance for both species. Detection radius is not a constant value and  
348 it varies across studies, because it changes according to target species, habitat and surveyor detection  
349 capability (Centili 2001, Esclarski & Cintra 2014, Menq & Anjos 2015, Zuberogitia *et al.* 2020). Therefore,  
350 given these sources of variation, tests like ours should be made before playback surveys.

351 Based on our results, at 300 m we found that the detection capability was quite weak overall, mainly in  
352 terms of the ability to estimate distances correctly. Therefore, we suggest that a 200 m detectability radius  
353 should be set as maximum threshold. In our study any inference from playback can only be reliably related  
354 to this radial distance around the surveyor, i.e. inferences about our target species should be limited to 200  
355 m because most of the detected calls will be within that distance. For Common Nightingale, Water Rail and  
356 Long-eared Owl, which were generally more difficult to detect than Little Owl and Tawny Owl, a radius of 100  
357 m could certainly be a good option. However, for a multi-species community level study, a common cut-off  
358 can ease the comparison of results at the same scale among all species. In this case, a 200 m limit would be  
359 a reasonable alternative. Distance estimates were, however, generally poor, and for most species the  
360 probability of accurately estimating distance was greater than 0.50 only at distances of 100 m or less.  
361 ~~Therefore, in our study, distance estimates are inappropriate for the use of distance sampling techniques~~  
362 ~~(e.g. Buckland *et al.* 1993, Neubauer & Sikora 2020), as they are not accurate enough to estimate species~~  
363 ~~density.~~ Distance sampling methodology is an appropriate tool to estimate density when distances to species  
364 are known, but it assumes distances to be estimated without errors (Buckland *et al.* 1993), which was not

the case in our study. Indeed, errors occur even with wide distance classes and experienced observers (Neubauer & Sikora 2020). We should stress that density estimation was not the purpose of our study. Instead, our goal was an attempt to understand at what scale detection and distribution could be estimated for our target species, which is likely a 200 m radius. At greater distances, detection probabilities became very low.

Based on different study objectives, researchers could carry out field experiments like this for their species of interest, identifying a suitable detectability radius through the evaluation of the two detectability components analysed prior to the actual surveys of the species. We recommend that our methods should be generally considered with more caution for Long-eared Owl, Common Nightingale and Water Rail. We particularly acknowledge that in our study, the component related to distance estimation could not be carried out accurately for these three species without training.

#### **Field experiment timing and potential bias**

As we described in methods, we maintained the same order of species calls during the experiment, potentially leading to a non-independence bias among subsequent calls of different species ~~among species~~. However, our results showed that this methodological choice unlikely affected GLMM outcomes. Estimates relative to the effect of distance on detectability did not differ substantially between GLMM and GEE approaches, and the significance levels of variables did not change. This suggests consistency between the two modelling approaches, hence we are confident that this kind of bias did not affect the validity of our analysis regarding the surveyor's ability to hear broadcast calls.

Although the focus of this study was on crepuscular and nocturnal species, the playback experiment was carried out during daytime ~~in daylight~~. This was partly due to access restrictions in some parts of the study area (particularly in rice fields), but also in order to avoid confounding real vocal responses from the study species. Similarly, the experiments started in late winter, when some of our target species are not vocally active or had not yet returned from their wintering areas (in particular Little Owl, Water Rail and Common



391 Nightingale). In order to make use of these results to inform methods for playback surveys of the target  
392 species, the underlying assumption that the performance of the surveyor is not affected by time of day and  
393 season needs to be addressed. In terms of the former, we would expect that background noise is likely to be  
394 higher in the daytime, both from natural and anthropogenic sources, hence we can consider our estimates  
395 to be appropriately conservative (i.e. we expect that performance would be higher at night). In terms of the  
396 latter, we did find evidence of seasonal effects in woodland, although these were inconsistent between  
397 probability of detection (which was marginally greater in winter) and probability of correct distance  
398 estimation (which increased in summer). However, the latter results did not change our overall conclusions  
399 regarding methodological recommendations, i.e. that playback surveys are likely to be most representative  
400 of a 200 m radius surrounding the surveyor where the probability of detection is highest, while estimates of  
401 distance from the observer are likely to be inaccurate in most cases.

402

403

## 404 **Acknowledgements**

405 We are grateful to the Park 'Parco del Po Vercellese-Alessandrino' which allowed the access to their areas  
406 and for the availability of bird songs at [www.xeno-canto.org](http://www.xeno-canto.org). We are also thankful for the very useful  
407 comments and suggestions provided by the anonymous reviewer that enabled us to improve our manuscript.

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

## 415 **References**

416  
417 **Alldredge, M. W., Simons, T. R. & Pollock, K. H.** 2007. A field evaluation of distance measurement error in  
418 auditory avian point count surveys. *Journal Wildl. Manage* **71**: 2759-2766.  
419  
420 **Appleby, B. M., Yamaguchi, N., Johnson, P. J. & Macdonald, D. W.** 1999. Sex-specific territorial responses in  
421 Tawny Owls *Strix aluco*. *Ibis* **141**: 91-99.  
422  
423 **Bartolommei, P., Mortelliti, A., Pezzo, F. & Puglisi, L.** 2012. Distribution of nocturnal birds (Strigiformes and  
424 Caprimulgidae) in relation to land-use types, extent and configuration in agricultural landscapes of Central  
425 Italy. *Rendiconti Lincei* **24**: 13-21.  
426  
427 **Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S.** 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. of*  
428 *Stat. Softw.* **67**: 1–48.  
429  
430 **Bolboacă, L.E., Artem, E. & Amarghioalei, V.** 2015. Breeding densities of Tawny Owl (*Strix aluco*) in eastern  
431 Moldova region (Romania). *Analele Ştiinţei şi Arte ale Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iaşi, s. Biologie*  
432 *animală* **61**: 39– 44.  
433  
434 **Booms, T. L., Schempf, P. F., McCaffery, B. J., Lindberg, M. S. & Fuller, M. R.** 2010. Detection probability of  
435 cliff-nesting raptors during helicopter and fixed-wing aircraft surveys in western Alaska. *J. Rap. Res.* **44**: 175-  
436 187.  
437  
438 **Braga, A. C. R. & Motta-Junior, J. C.** 2009. Weather conditions and moon phase influence on Tropical Screech  
439 Owl and Burrowing Owl detection by playback in southeast Brazil. *Ardea* **97**: 395-401.  
440  
441 **Brambilla, M. & Jenkins, R. K.** 2009. Cost-effective estimates of Water Rail *Rallus aquaticus* breeding  
442 population size. *Ardeola* **56**: 95-102.  
443  
444 **Buckland, S.T., Anderson, D.R., Burnham, K.P. & Laake, J.L.** 1993. *Distance Sampling: Estimating Abundance*  
445 *of Biology Populations*. Chapman & Hall, London.  
446  
447 **Centili, D.** 2001. Broadcast and Little Owls *Athene noctua*: preliminary results and considerations. *Oriolus* **67**:  
448 84-88.  
449  
450 **Clewley, G. D., Norfolk, D. L., Leech, D. I. & Balmer, D. E.** 2016. Playback survey trial for the Little Owl *Athene*  
451 *noctua* in the UK. *Bird Study* **63**: 268-272.  
452  
453 **Cook, R.D.** 1979. Influential observations in linear regression. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.* **74**: 169–174  
454  
455 **Crowe, D. E. & Longshore, K. M.** 2013. Nest site characteristics and nesting success of the western Burrowing  
456 Owl in the eastern Mojave Desert. *J. arid environ.* **94**: 113-120.  
457  
458 **Currie, D., Millett, J., Hill, M. & Shah, N. J.** 2002. Factors affecting the response of Seychelles Scops-Owl *Otus*  
459 *insularis* to playback of conspecific calls: consequences for monitoring and management. *Bird. Cons. Int.* **12**:  
460 353-364.  
461  
462 **Esclarski, P. & Cintra, R.** 2014. Effects of terra firme-forest structure on habitat use by owls (Aves:  
463 Strigiformes) in central Brazilian Amazonia. *Ornitol. Neotrop.* **25**: 433-458.  
464  
465 **Flesch, A. D. & Steidl, R. J.** 2007. Detectability and response rates of Ferruginous Pygmy-Owls. *J. Wildl.*  
466 *Manage* **71**: 981-990.  
467

468 **Halekoh, U., Højsgaard, S. & Yan, J.** 2006. The R Package geepack for Generalized Estimating Equations. *J. of*  
469 *Stat. Softw.* **15/2**: 1–11.

470

471 **Hardy, P. C. & Morrison, M. L.** 2000. Factors affecting the detection of elf owls and western screech owls.  
472 *Wildlife Soc. B.* 333-342.

473

474 **Haug, E. A. & Didiuk, A. B.** 1993. Use of Recorded Calls to Detect Burrowing Owls. *J. Field Ornithol.* **64**: 188-  
475 194.

476

477 **Jacobsen, L. B., Sunde, P., Rahbek, C., Dabelsteen, T. & Thorup, K.** 2013. Territorial calls in the Little Owl  
478 (*Athene noctua*): spatial dispersion and social interplay of mates and neighbours. *Ornis Fenn.* **90**: 41-49.

479

480 **Jiguet, F. & Williamson, T.** 2010. Estimating local population size of the European Nightjar *Caprimulgus*  
481 *europaeus* using territory capture–recapture models. *Bird Study* **57**: 509-514.

482

483 **Johnson, R. R., Brown, B. T., Haight, L. T. & Simpson, J. M.** 1981. Playback recordings as a special avian  
484 censusing technique. *Stud. Avian Biol.* **6**: 68-75.

485

486 **Johnson, D. H., Van Nieuwenhuyse, D. & Génot, J. C.** 2009. Survey protocol for the Little Owl *Athene noctua*.  
487 *Ardea* **97**: 403-412.

488

489 **Johnston, A., Fink, D., Hochachka, W. M. & Kelling, S.** 2018. Estimates of observer expertise improve species  
490 distributions from citizen science data. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **9**: 88-97.

491

492 **Kiefer, S., Scharff, C. & Kipper, S.** 2011. Does age matter in song bird vocal interactions? Results from  
493 interactive playback experiments. *Front. Zool.* **8**: 1-8.

494

495 **Marques, T. A.** 2004. Predicting and correcting bias caused by measurement error in line transect sampling  
496 using multiplicative error models. *Biometrics* **60**: 757-763.

497

498 **Menq, W. & Anjos, L.** 2015. Habitat selection by owls in a seasonal semi-deciduous forest in southern Brazil.  
499 *Braz. J. Biol.* **75**: 143-149.

500

501 **Navarro, J., Minguez, E., Garcia, D., Villacorta, C., Botella, F., Sanchez-Zapata, J.A., Carrete, M. & Giménez,**  
502 **A.** 2005. Differential effectiveness of playbacks for Little Owls (*Athene noctua*) surveys before and after  
503 sunset. *J. Rap. Res.* **39**: 457– 461.

504

505 **Neubauer, G. & Sikora, A.** 2020. Abundance estimation from point counts when replication is spatially  
506 intensive but temporally limited: comparing binomial N-mixture and hierarchical distance sampling models.  
507 *Ornis Fenn.* **97**: 131-148.

508

509 **Pilla, P., Puan, C. L., Lim, V. C., Azhar, B. & Zakaria, M.** 2018. Sunda Scops-Owl density estimation via distance  
510 sampling and call playback. *Sains Malays.* **47**: 441-446.

511

512 **Polak, M.** 2005. Temporal pattern of vocal activity of the Water Rail *Rallus aquaticus* and the Little Crake  
513 *Porzana parva* in the breeding season. *Acta Ornithol.* **40**: 21-26.

514

515 **Proudfoot, G. A., Beasom, S. L., Chavez-Ramirez, F. & Mays, J. L.** 2002. Response distance of ferruginous  
516 pygmy-owls to broadcast conspecific calls. *J. Raptor. Res.* **39**: 457-461.

517 **Puglisi, L. & Bartolommei, P.** 2012. Il monitoraggio degli uccelli notturni in Toscana. *Rivista Italiana di*  
518 *Ornitologia* **82**: 43-47. (in Italian).

519 **R Core Team.** 2020. R: *A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical  
520 Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>.  
521

522 **Schmidt, R., Kunc, H. P., Amrhein, V. & Naguib, M.** 2006. Responses to interactive playback predict future  
523 pairing success in nightingales. *Anim. Behav.* **72**: 1355-1362.  
524

525 **Seoane, S. S. & Galván, I.** 2010. Short-term dynamics and spatial pattern of nocturnal birds inhabiting a  
526 Mediterranean agricultural mosaic. *Ardeola* **57**: 303-320.  
527

528 **Stermin, A. N., David, A., Drăgoi, C., Cîmpean, M. & Battes, K. P.** 2017. Neighbours vs. strangers  
529 discrimination in water rail (*Rallus aquaticus*). *Studia UBB Biologia* **62**: 75-83.  
530

531 **Vrezec, A. & Bertoneclj, I.** 2018. Territory monitoring of Tawny Owls *Strix aluco* using playback calls is a  
532 reliable population monitoring method. *Bird Study* **65**: S52-S62.

533 **Wickham H.** 2016. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Available at:  
534 <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>.

535 **Worthington-Hill, J. & Conway, G.** 2017. Tawny Owl *Strix aluco* response to call-broadcasting and  
536 implications for survey design. *Bird Study* **64**: 205-210.  
537

538 **Hosmer, D. W. & Lemeshow, S.** 2000. *Applied logistic regression*. Wiley, New York.  
539

540 **Zuberogitia, I. & Campos, L. F.** 1998. Censusing owls in large areas: a comparison between methods.  
541 *Ardeola* **45**: 47-53.  
542

543 **Zuberogitia, I., Martínez, J. E., González-Oreja, J. A., de Buitrago, C. G., Belamendia, G., Zabala, J., Laso,**  
544 **M., Pagaldai, N. & Jiménez-Franco, M. V.** 2020. Maximizing detection probability for effective large-scale  
545 nocturnal bird monitoring. *Divers. Distrib.* **26**: 1034-1050.  
546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

## Appendix

**Table S1: model outputs parameter estimates from the binomial GLMM/GEE explaining the ability to hear playback calls and estimate distances correctly**

**Table S1a.** Ability to hear playback calls in farmland and woodland in relation to distance.

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	Z value	P value
Intercept	1.399	0.398	3.511	0.0004
SReal distance	-1.636	0.169	-9.696	< 2e-16
Habitat (Woodland)	1.859	0.513	3.627	0.0003
Species (Little Owl)	2.089	0.458	4.562	5.1e-06
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.897	0.351	-2.561	0.010
Species (Tawny Owl)	1.720	0.430	4.001	6.3e-05
Species (Water Rail)	-0.065	0.358	-0.181	0.856

Model outcome showing fixed effects. Model formula: *Regis heard* ~ *SReal distance* + *Habitat* + *Species* + (1|*Point*), where *Regis heard* stands for surveyor ability to have heard or not playback calls and *Real distance* was scaled (S). The reference level (Intercept) is represented by 'Farmland' for Habitat and 'Common Nightingale' for Species. Random effect variance:  $0.8 \pm 0.9$ .

**Table S1b.** Ability to hear playback calls in farmland and woodland in relation to distance (GEE model).

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	w value	P value
Intercept	1.297	0.272	22.679	1.9e-06
SReal distance	-1.613	0.153	110.959	< 2e-16
Habitat (Woodland)	1.466	0.316	21.463	3.6e-06
Species (Little Owl)	1.896	0.416	20.730	5.3e-06
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.784	0.296	7.032	0.008
Species (Tawny Owl)	1.576	0.410	14.763	0.0001
Species (Water Rail)	-0.053	0.261	0.040	0.841

Model outcome showing fixed effects. The model was fitted with the command `geeglm` (geepack package) with the formula: *Regis heard* ~ *SReal distance* + *Habitat* + *Species*, where *Regis heard* stands for surveyor ability to have heard or not playback calls and *Real distance* was scaled (S). The model accounted for the potential non-independence of observations specifying in the formula: *id* = *Group*, *waves* = *Time order*, *corstr* = "unstructured". *Group* identifies species broadcasts within a playback repetition (each group combined point identity and repetition number); *Time order* identifies the order of observations (broadcast calls) and *corstr* = "unstructured" specifies the correlation structure. The reference level (Intercept) is represented by 'Farmland' for Habitat and 'Common Nightingale' for Species. Model alpha parameter:  $1.2 \pm 0.1$ .

597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628

**Table S1c.** Ability to estimate playback distances correctly in farmland and woodland in relation to distance.

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	Z value	P value
Intercept	-2.516	0.482	-5.220	1.7e-07
SReal distance	-1.393	0.163	-8.560	< 2e-16
Habitat (Woodland)	1.888	0.585	3.230	0.001
Species (Little Owl)	-0.290	0.309	-0.940	0.348
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-1.593	0.355	-4.490	7.0e-06
Species (Tawny Owl)	-0.441	0.312	-1.410	0.157
Species (Water Rail)	-0.241	0.308	-0.780	0.435

Model outcome showing fixed effects. ~~Model formula: Estimate correct ~~~  
~~SReal distance + Habitat + Species + (1|Point)~~, where ~~Estimate correct~~ stands  
for surveyor ability to have estimated playback distances correctly or not and  
~~Real distance~~ was scaled (S). The reference level (Intercept) is represented by  
‘Farmland’ for Habitat and ‘Common Nightingale’ for Species. Random effect variance: 1.3 ± 1.2.

**Table S1d.** Ability to hear playback calls in woodland in relation to distance and season.

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	Z value	P value
Intercept	0.916	0.419	2.190	0.029
SReal distance	-1.419	0.185	-7.670	1.8e-14
Season (Winter)	1.601	0.299	5.350	8.8e-08
Species (Little Owl)	2.335	0.452	5.160	2.5e-07
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.105	0.323	-0.320	0.746
Species (Tawny Owl)	2.335	0.452	5.160	2.5e-07
Species (Water Rail)	0.107	0.327	0.330	0.742
SReal distance:Season (Winter)	-0.161	0.322	-0.500	0.617

Model outcome showing fixed effects. ~~Model formula: Regis heard ~ SReal~~  
~~distance\*Season + Species + (1|Point)~~. The expression in the formula ~~SReal~~  
~~distance\*Season~~ and in the output SReal distance:Season indicates the  
interaction between distance and season and ~~Real distance~~ was scaled (S).  
The reference level (Intercept) is represented by ‘Summer’ for Season and  
‘Common Nightingale’ for Species. Random effect variance: 1.1 ± 1.

629  
630 **Table S1e.** Ability to hear playback calls in woodland in relation to distance  
631 and season (without outliers).

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	Z value	P value
Intercept	0.975	0.543	1.790	0.073
SReal distance	-1.646	0.208	-7.930	2.2e-15
Season (Winter)	1.953	0.339	5.740	9.2e-09
Species (Little Owl)	2.563	0.479	5.350	8.7e-08
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.003	0.343	-0.010	0.994
Species (Tawny Owl)	2.715	0.494	5.490	4.0e-08
Species (Water Rail)	0.179	0.347	0.520	0.605
SReal distance:Season (Winter)	-0.139	0.369	-0.380	0.707

632 Model outcome obtained removing the outliers. ~~Model formula: *Regis heard* ~~~  
633 ~~*SReal distance*\**Season* + *Species* + (*1*/*Point*).~~ The expression in the formula  
634 ~~*SReal distance*\**Season*~~ and in the output SReal distance:Season indicates  
635 the interaction between distance and season and ~~*Real distance* was scaled (S).~~  
636 The reference level (Intercept) is represented by 'Summer' for Season and  
637 'Common Nightingale' for Species. Random effect variance: 2.2 ± 1.5.

640  
641 **Table S1f.** Ability to hear playback calls in woodland in relation to distance  
642 and season (GEE model).

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	w value	P value
Intercept	0.760	0.255	8.870	0.003
SReal distance	-1.038	0.237	19.190	1.2e-05
Season (Winter)	1.364	0.320	18.180	2.0e-05
Species (Little Owl)	1.987	0.391	25.860	3.7e-07
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.091	0.255	0.130	0.722
Species (Tawny Owl)	1.981	0.395	25.200	5.2e-07
Species (Water Rail)	0.083	0.226	0.130	0.715
SReal distance:Season (Winter)	-0.448	0.302	2.200	0.138

643 Model outcome obtained removing the outliers. ~~The model was fitted with the~~  
644 ~~command *geeglm* (geepack package) with the formula: *Regis heard* ~~~  
645 ~~*SReal distance*\**Season* + *Species*.~~ The expression in the formula ~~*SReal distance*\*~~  
646 ~~*Season*~~ and in the output SReal distance:Season indicates the interaction  
647 between distance and season and ~~*Real distance* was scaled (S).~~ The model  
648 accounted for the potential non-independence of observations specifying in  
649 the formula: ~~*id* = *Group*, *waves* = *Time order*, *corstr* = "unstructured".~~ *Group*  
650 identifies species broadcasts within a playback repetition (each group combined  
651 point identity and repetition number); ~~*Time order*~~ identifies the order of  
652 observations (broadcast calls) and ~~*corstr* = "unstructured"~~ specifies the  
653 correlation structure. The reference level (Intercept) is represented by 'Summer'  
654 for Season and 'Common Nightingale' for Species. Model alpha parameter: 0.3 ± 0.2.

660  
661  
662  
  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690

**Table S1g.** Ability to estimate playback distances correctly in woodland in relation to distance and season.

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	Z value	P value
Intercept	-0.239	0.269	-0.890	0.374
SReal distance	-0.756	0.123	-6.140	8.4e-10
Season (Winter)	-0.619	0.188	-3.300	0.0009
Species (Little Owl)	-0.032	0.253	-0.130	0.899
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.676	0.262	-2.580	0.009
Species (Tawny Owl)	-0.162	0.254	-0.640	0.525
Species (Water Rail)	-0.162	0.254	-0.640	0.525
SReal distance:Season (Winter)	-0.582	0.227	-2.560	0.010

Model outcome showing fixed effects. ~~Model formula: Estimate correct ~ SReal distance \* Season + Species + (1|Point).~~ The expression in the formula ~~SReal distance \* Season~~ and in the output ~~SReal distance:Season~~ indicates the interaction between distance and season and ~~Real distance~~ was scaled (~~S~~). The reference level (Intercept) is represented by 'Summer' for Season and 'Common Nightingale' for Species. Random effect variance: 0.3 ± 0.6.

**Table S1h.** Ability to estimate playback distances correctly in woodland in relation to distance and season (without outliers).

Variable	Estimate	Standard error	Z value	P value
Intercept	-0.344	0.292	-1.180	0.238
SReal distance	-1.010	0.141	-7.150	8.5e-13
Season (Winter)	-0.875	0.223	-3.920	8.9e-05
Species (Little Owl)	-0.036	0.269	-0.130	0.893
Species (Long-eared Owl)	-0.923	0.285	-3.240	0.001
Species (Tawny Owl)	-0.183	0.270	-0.680	0.499
Species (Water Rail)	-0.216	0.271	-0.800	0.426
SReal distance:Season (Winter)	-0.888	0.281	-3.160	0.0016

Model outcome obtained removing the outliers. ~~Model formula: Estimate correct ~ SReal distance \* Season + Species + (1|Point).~~ The expression in the formula ~~SReal distance \* Season~~ and in the output ~~SReal distance:Season~~ indicates the interaction between distance and season and ~~Real distance~~ was scaled (~~S~~). The reference level (Intercept) is represented by 'Summer' for Season and 'Common Nightingale' for Species. Random effect variance: 0.4 ± 0.6.



691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707

**Tables S2-S3: errors in distance estimation**

**Table S2.** Errors in distance estimation made by the surveyor across surveys. The total number of broadcast calls is 400 in each survey.

Distance class (m)	Survey	Number of detected broadcasts	Number of wrong estimates	Percentage of wrong estimates (%)	Number of OE	Percentage of OE (%)	Number of UE	Percentage of UE(%)
0-100	First	288	0	0	0	0	0	0
100-200			36	14.5	36	14.5	0	0
200-300			61	24.6	61	24.6	0	0
300-400			67	27.0	67	27.0	0	0
400-500			46	18.6	46	18.6	0	0
>500			38	15.3	38	15.3	0	0
<b>Total</b>			248	100	248	100	0	0
0-100	Second	366	0	0	0	0	0	0
100-200			46	21.4	46	21.4	0	0
200-300			107	49.8	107	49.8	0	0
300-400			48	22.3	48	22.3	0	0
400-500			10	4.7	10	4.7	0	0
>500			4	1.9	4	1.9	0	0
<b>Total</b>			215	100	215	100	0	0
0-100	Third	289	33	23.7	0	0	33	66.0
100-200			44	31.7	27	30.3	17	34.0
200-300			39	28.1	39	43.8	0	0
300-400			23	16.6	23	25.8	0	0
400-500			0	0	0	0	0	0
>500			0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>			139	100	89	100	50	100

Number and percentages of wrong distance estimates (for the calls that have been detected) per distance class made by the surveyor. Overestimates (OE) consist in estimates made in a class further than the correct one (i.e. further from the surveyor position), while underestimates (UE) consist in estimates made in a class prior than the correct one (i.e. closer to the surveyor position). Distances estimated wrongly declined across surveys, with underestimates placed only in the first two distance classes of the last survey. The first column indicates all the possible distance classes planned for the experiment, in which the surveyor could assign playback calls. Unlike **Table 1**, which provides real distance classes (i.e. those where the broadcaster actually stationed at), here there are also ‘400 - 500 m’ and ‘> 500 m’ because the surveyor, being unaware of the broadcaster’s position, could assign calls in these two classes too.

708 **Table S3.** Errors in distance estimation made by the surveyor across the surveys in relation to species. The  
709 total number of broadcast calls is 400 in each survey.

Species	Survey	Number of detected broadcasts	Number of wrong estimates	Percentage of wrong estimates (%)	Number of OE	Percentage of OE (%)	Number of UE	Percentage of UE (%)
Common Nightingale	First	288	44	17.7	44	17.7	0	0
Water Rail			44	17.7	44	17.7	0	0
Little Owl			62	25.0	62	25.0	0	0
Long-eared Owl			39	15.7	39	15.7	0	0
Tawny Owl			59	23.8	59	23.8	0	0
<b>Total</b>			248	100	248	100	0	0
Common Nightingale	Second	366	33	15.4	33	15.4	0	0
Water Rail			37	17.2	37	17.2	0	0
Little Owl			45	20.9	45	20.9	0	0
Long-eared Owl			51	23.7	51	23.7	0	0
Tawny Owl			49	22.8	49	22.8	0	0
<b>Total</b>			215	100	215	100	0	0
Common Nightingale	Third	289	19	13.7	10	11.2	9	18.0
Water Rail			23	16.5	13	14.6	10	20.0
Little Owl			39	28.1	28	31.5	11	22.0
Long-eared Owl			19	13.7	10	11.2	9	18.0
Tawny Owl			39	28.1	28	31.5	11	22.0
<b>Total</b>			139	100	89	100	50	100

710 Number and percentages of wrong distance estimates (for the calls that have been detected) per distance  
711 class made by the surveyor. The table reflects **Table S2**, but here over- (OE) and underestimates (UE) are  
712 referred to species. Generally, most distances estimated wrongly are associated with owls.

713

714

715 **Tables**

716 **Table 1.** Summary of the values obtained during the field experiment.

Distance class (m)	Number of broadcast calls	Percentage of broadcast calls (%)	Number of correct distance estimates	Percentage of correct distance estimates (%)	Number of calls detected	Percentage of calls detected (%)
0-100	315	26.3	148	46.9	312	99.1
100-200	615	51.3	148	24.1	490	79.7
200-300	240	20.0	36	25.7	132	55.0
300-400	30	2.5	5	16.7	9	30.0
<b>Total</b>	1200	100	337	28.1	943	78.6

717 Number and percentage of broadcast calls, correct distance estimates and calls detected according to  
718 distance classes.

719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742

## 743    **Legends to figures**

744

745    **Figure 1:** Binomial GLMM showing the predicted probabilities of hearing playback calls in farmland (n =  
746    400) and woodland (n = 400) in relation to distance.

747    **Figure 2:** Binomial GLMM showing the predicted probabilities of estimating distances correctly in farmland  
748    (n = 400) and woodland (n = 400) in relation to distance.

749    **Figure 3:** Binomial GLMM showing the predicted probabilities of hearing playback calls in woodland in  
750    relation to distance and season (n = 400 in winter and n = 400 in summer).

751

752    **Figure 4:** Binomial GLMM showing the predicted probabilities of estimating distances correctly in woodland  
753    in relation to distance and season (n = 400 in winter and n = 400 in summer).

754

755    **Figure 5:** Pictures taken in woodland at the same point in winter and summer to show the difference in terms  
756    of vegetation structure, which can act as a natural “acoustic barrier”.

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773


774

775

776 **Figures**

777


778 **Figure 1**



779

780

781 **Figure 2**



782


783

784

785


786

787 **Figure 3**



788

789 **Figure 4**



790

791 **Figure 5**



792